

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/704,261	11/01/2000	Alok Nigam	ANAMD-001BC	3552
33197 759	90 04/20/2004		EXAMINER	
STOUT, UXA, BUYAN & MULLINS LLP			DEAK, LESLIE R	
4 VENTURE, SUITE 300 IRVINE, CA 92618			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3762	. <u> </u>
			DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

المنفر	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/704,261	NIGAM, ALOK			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Leslie R. Deak	3762			
The MAILING DATE of this commo	unication appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMU - Extensions of time may be available under the provisic after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this co - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for re Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	NICATION. ons of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may mmunication. (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of it statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) M ply will, by statute, cause the application to become is after the mailing date of this communication, even	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) 1	iled on				
2a) This action is FINAL .	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition	on for allowance except for formal m	atters, prosecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the pra-	ctice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C	i.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) is/are pending in t 4a) Of the above claim(s) is 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to rest	/are withdrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
	re: a) accepted or b) objected for b) objected for accepted for bjection to the drawing(s) be held in abeying the correction is required if the drawing	vance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
2. Certified copies of the priori3. Copies of the certified copie	ty documents have been received. ty documents have been received in s of the priority documents have be tional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	a Application No en received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)		,			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		w Summary (PTO-413)			
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	(PTO-948) Paper N	lo(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/704,261

Art Unit: 3762

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-15, 17 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,007,510 to Nigam. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims presented in the instant application are obvious variations of the previously patented device. In particular, the claim limitations drawn to the placement of the fluid shunting device within the eye is a statement of the intended use of the device. It has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. See MPEP 2114. With regard to the limitations drawn to the dimensions of the device, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust the size of the device within the range required by the intended use of the device,

Application/Control Number: 09/704,261 Page 3

Art Unit: 3762

since it has been heals that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. See MPEP 2144.04, 2144.05.

3. Claims 16 and 18-21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 13, and 14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,007,510 to Nigam in view of US 4,554,918 to White. The Nigam reference discloses the device as claimed but not the method of insertion. White discloses an optical fluid shunt and a method of insertion that involves making an incision into a subconjuctival space and placing the shunt with or without sutures in order to shunt aqueous humor into other tissues to relieve interocular pressure (see column 6, lines 25-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to position the shunt disclosed by Nigam in the subconjunctival space as disclosed by White in order to relieve intraocular pressure, as taught by White.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

a. US 4,037,604

Newkirk

Biological drainage device inserted into the eye.

b. US 4,604,087

Joseph

ii. Aqueous humor drainage device.

Art Unit: 3762

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie R. Deak whose telephone number is 703-305-0200. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00, every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 703-308-5181. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lrd// 18 April 2004

ANGELA D. SYKES SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

angel. D. Styles